

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Applicant: Arun Kumar Jaura et al.
Serial No: 10/064,998
Filing Date: September 6, 2002
Group Art Unit: 3618
Confirmation No: 1850
Examiner: Vaughn Coolman
Title: COOLING SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR A HYBRID
ELECTRIC VEHICLE
Attorney Docket No: 81078760 (36190-167)
Customer No: 28549

Mailstop: Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 11, 2007

APPELLANTS' REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This Reply is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer of October 12, 2007.

Certificate of Mailing/Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited via electronic submission on the USPTO website.

Commissioner for Patents
PO BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on 12-11-07



Kelly Makin

In the Reply Brief dated October 12, 2007, the Examiner focuses the rejection of Appellants' claims upon Figure 2 of Barrie et al. (U.S. Patent 5,217,085). Figure 2 of Barrie shows a parallel lubrication and cooling circuits (see Barrie at Column 4, Lines 1-3). Thus, Barrie's pressure regulator valve 50, when in the position shown in Figure 2, permits no flow from reservoir 44 to motor 28. If pump speed 46 is increased, valve 50 splits the flow from pump 46 so that some flow will be permitted to motor 28 and some oil will flow to lubrication system 30. In other words, there is never any situation with Barrie's Figure 2, or, for that matter, any other embodiment, when the flow from pump 46 moves first through a transmission, (which is not shown in Barrie), and then through a traction motor 28 in a single loop. Herein lies the crux of the issue between the Examiner and Appellants: Appellants' device claims circulation of cooling fluid, as shown succinctly in Appellants' Figure 2, from an oil cooler 78 to a transmission 87 and then to an integrated starter generator 63, in a loop. In contrast, Barrie shows circulation through either a motor or through a transmission, with none of the fluid ever flowing directly from the transmission to the motor. In other words, Barrie does not show a cooling loop including a transmission, a motor, and a heat exchanger. As a result, Appellants once again respectfully submit that each of the claims in this case is allowable over the Examiner's rejection, and the Board is respectfully requested to reverse the decision of the Examiner.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge any fee deficiency or refund any excess to
Deposit Account No. 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerome R. Drouillard (Registration No. 28,008)
Dickinson Wright PLLC
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-2970
734-623-1698

Date: 12/10/07

ANNARBOR 36190-167 94241v1